

Notes from meeting with D/Pers - 12 May 1982

STAT

Re: Conduct of [redacted] Case

1. Met with D/Pers on 12 May to discuss the [redacted] STAT Case. D/Pers had concern over the evaluation concepts and the basis for which OGC selected the Class. Factors influencing his concern focused on Ops. Officer definitions, their classification and position description; the fact that males enter the service through a different route than females (in the main females enter via the clerical route) and males become immobile even with early overseas experience and Ops. training. Moreover, DO did not document certain changes, i.e., clericals were designated Ops. officers (or variants thereof) when in fact they were still clericals (super-clericals in professional positions).

2. Reviewed modeling strategy in some detail, i.e., the formulation of two models subsequent to completing the descriptive statistics requirements. Also reviewed OGC timing and plan to buy us time to prospect for variables and generate models. D/Pers believes model development and completion is useful even if we are unable to complete it in time to meet the court's uncertain deadlines. (Aside: D/Pers' comments sound similar to DD/DI comments regarding analysis to help management

identify potential litigation problems

3. D/Pers said he felt better about the class action after our conversation. Moreover, he wanted to get together after the data base was completed. Along these lines I also volunteered a briefing after model development and preliminary results were completed to indicate what data and analysis showed us. (This would be similar to what we did in [redacted] for HF, BD, & OGC.) He agreed. There is no doubt about his interest in this case and he suggested more detail in the bi-weekly reports if I wished to go into it.

STAT

4. The subject of resources and OP/OGC interaction was discussed obliquely. D/Pers good naturedly referred to OGC's attitude of treating OP's resources as their own after obtaining support. Bureaucratically, precipitating "request for support" memos by OP reminds OGC of resource ownership. If OGC continues to increase their demands on OP, perhaps D/Pers may ask them for additional slots. This last statement may have been a facetious remark.

5. All in all it was a good meeting.

[redacted]  
STAT

routing sheet note to front office

Prior to Jim's departure for leave we met to discuss an informal request ~~for~~ the General Counsel that an expanded jurimetrics effort be provided. We concluded that the request was legitimate, needed and would be very useful. However, within present ~~POP~~ priorities, it could not be accommodated without additional resources. You asked Don, Al, Jim and I to prepare a request for additional positions to support jurimetrics for OGC endorsement and ExDir approval. This is attached.

routing sheet from Glerum via Sporkin to Briggs with following under comments to OGC

Stan:

Following our conversation of a few weeks ago I met with my staff to determine what kind of "jurimetric" support we could provide. We concluded that although this support was needed and useful, we could not ~~provide~~ ~~it~~ provide it within available resources. Thus, I am asking for your support in seeking additional position ceiling so as to provide jurimetric support.

JIM